arXiv:nucl-th/0201041v1 17 Jan 2002

ON THE THEORY OF NUCLEAR ANAPOLE MOMENTS

V.F. Dmitriev[1], and I.B. Khriplovich[2]

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

Abstract

We discuss the present state of the theory of nuclear anapole moments.

Forty-five years ago it was pointed out [1] that in a system which has no definite parity a special distribution of magnetic field may arise. It cannot be reduced to common electromagnetic multipoles, such as dipole or quadrupole moments, but looks like the magnetic field created by a current in toroidal winding. This special source of electromagnetic field was called (by A.S. Kompaneets) "anapole".

For many years the anapole remained a theoretical curiosity only. The situation has changed due to the investigation of parity nonconservation (PNC) in atoms. Since these tiny effects increase with the nuclear charge Z, all the experiments are carried out with heavy atoms. The main contribution to the effect is independent of nuclear spin and caused by the parity-violating weak interaction of electron and nucleon neutral currents. This interaction is proportional to the so-called weak nuclear charge Q which is numerically close (up to the sign) to the neutron number N. Thus, in heavy atoms the nuclear-spin-independent weak interaction is additionally enhanced by about two orders of magnitude. Meanwhile, the nuclear-spin-dependent effects due to neutral currents not only lack the mentioned coherent enhancement, but are also strongly suppressed numerically in the electroweak theory. Therefore, the observation of PNC nuclear-spin-dependent effects in atoms looked absolutely unrealistic.

However, it was demonstrated [2, 3] that these effects in atoms are dominated not by the weak interaction of neutral currents, but by the electromagnetic interaction of atomic electrons with nuclear anapole moment (AM). It should be mentioned first of all that the magnetic field of an anapole is contained within it, in the same way as the magnetic field of a toroidal winding is completely confined inside the winding. It means that the electromagnetic interaction of an electron with the nuclear AM occurs only as long as the electron wave function penetrates the nucleus. In other words, this electromagnetic interaction is as local as the weak interaction, and they cannot be distinguished by this interaction. The nuclear AM is induced by PNC nuclear forces and is therefore proportional to the same Fermi constant $G = 1.027 \times 10^{-5} m^{-2}$ (we use the units $\hbar = 1, c = 1$; m is the proton mass), which determines the magnitude of the weak interactions in general and that of neutral currents in particular. The electron interaction with the AM, being of the electromagnetic nature, introduces an extra small factor into the effect discussed, the fine-structure constant $\alpha = 1/137$. Then, how it comes that this effect is dominating? The answer follows from the same picture of a toroidal

[1]e-mail address: dmitriev@inp.nsk.su

[2]e-mail address: khriplovich@inp.nsk.su

winding. It is only natural that the interaction discussed is proportional to the magnetic flux through such a winding, and hence in our case to the cross-section of the nucleus, i.e. to $A^{2/3}$ where A is the atomic number. In heavy nuclei this enhancement factor is close to 30 and compensates essentially for the smallness of the fine-structure constant α. As a result, the dimensionless effective constant κ which characterizes the anapole interaction in the units of G is not so small in heavy atoms, but is numerically close to 0.3 (we use the same definition of the effective constant κ as in [2, 3]).

The nuclear anapole moment was experimentally discovered in 1997 [4]. This result for the total effective constant of the PNC nuclear-spin-dependent interaction in ^{137}Cs is

$$\kappa_{tot} = 0.44(6). \tag{1}$$

To extract this number from experimental data, the results of atomic calculations [5, 6] were used; these calculations performed using different approaches are in excellent agreement, and there are good reasons to believe that their accuracy is no worth than 2-3%. If one excludes the neutral current nuclear-spin-dependent contribution from the above number, as well as the result of the combined action of the "weak" charge Q and the usual hyperfine interaction, the answer for the anapole constant will be

$$\kappa = 0.37(6). \tag{2}$$

Thus, the existence of an AM of the ^{137}Cs nucleus is reliably established. A beautiful new physical phenomenon, a peculiar electromagnetic multipole has been discovered.

But the discussed result does not reduce to only this. It brings valuable information on PNC nuclear forces. Of course, to this end it should be combined with reliable nuclear calculations. However, it is instructive to start their discussion, as it was done in [3]), with a rather crude approximation. Not only one assumes here that the nuclear spin $\mathbf{I}$ coincides with the total angular momentum of an odd valence nucleon, while the other nucleons form a core with the zero angular momentum. The next assumption is that the core density $\rho(r)$ is constant throughout the space and coincides with the mean nuclear density ρ_0. The last assumption, ascending to [7], is reasonable if the wave function of the external nucleon is mainly localized in the region of the core. Then simple calculations give the following result for the anapole constant [3]:

$$\kappa = \frac{9}{10}\, g\, \frac{\alpha\mu}{mr_0}\, A^{2/3}. \tag{3}$$

Here g is the effective constant of the P-odd interaction of the outer nucleon with the nuclear core, μ is the magnetic moment of the outer nucleon, $r_0 = 1.2$ fm. The A-dependence of this constant is very natural. Indeed, since the anapole corresponds to the magnetic field configuration induced by a toroidal winding, the AM value should be proportional to the magnetic flux, i.e., to the cross-section area of the nucleus, hence to $A^{2/3}$.

The so-called "best values" for the parameters of P-odd nuclear forces [8] result in $g_p = 4.5$ for an outer proton [3, 9, 10]. Thus obtained values for AMs of the nuclei of experimental interest are presented in the first column of Table.

Various calculations of the nuclear AMs, going beyond simple analytical formula (3), (see the results in Table) can be roughly divided into two groups: the calculations within the

	[3]$^{a)}$	[3]$^{b)}$	[11]$^{c)}$	[12, 13]$^{d)}$	[14]$^{e)}$	[14]$^{f)}$	[15]$^{g)}$	[16]	[17]	[18]
^{133}Cs	0.37	0.28	0.14 (0.28)	0.27	0.33	0.26	0.22	—	0.15	0.21
^{203,205}Tl	0.49	0.43	—	0.27	0.42	0.40	0.37	0.24	0.24	0.10
^{209}Bi	0.51	0.35	—	0.27	0.45	0.29	0.30	—	0.15	—

Table

a)Calculation with formula (3). b)Woods-Saxon potential including spin-orbit interaction. c)Only the P-odd π-meson-exchange was calculated in [11]; we indicate in brackets what to our guess would be the result of [11] if the P-odd short-range were included. d)Our extrapolation of the results of [12, 13], from their values of g_p to $g_p = 4.5$. e)Oscillator potential, contribution of contact current included. f)Woods-Saxon potential, contributions of contact and spin-orbit currents included. g)Many-body corrections calculated in the constant-density approximation.

independent particle model (IPM) using Woods-Saxon and oscillator potentials [3, 12-14], and the calculations including many-body effects [11, 15-18]. In fact, some of the many-body contributions were discussed in [12, 13] as well.

The analytical estimate (3) produces smooth $A^{2/3}$ behaviour, but certainly exaggerates the effect due to the assumption that the P-odd contact interaction with the nuclear core extends throughout the whole localization region of the unpaired nucleon. Indeed, the IPM calculations reveal certain shell effects quite pronounced in the values of κ for Tl and Bi (see Table). Both these nuclei are close to the doubly-magic ^{208}Pb. However, while the anapole moment of Tl nucleus in IPM is close to its analytical estimate, the anapole moment of Bi in IPM differs significantly both from the analytical formula and from the anapole moment of Tl. This difference can be attributed to the difference in the single-particle orbitals for the unpaired proton in Tl and Bi. The $3s_{1/2}$ wave function in Tl is concentrated essentially inside the nuclear core, while the $1h_{9/2}$ wave function in Bi is pushed strongly outside of it. By this reason the unpaired proton in Bi "feels" in fact much smaller part of the P-odd weak potential. An analogous suppression of the PNC interaction takes place for the outer $1g_{7/2}$ proton in Cs.

Various approaches were used as well in the many-body calculations [11, 15-18]. In one of them [15, 17] the random-phase approximation (RPA) with effective forces was employed to calculate the effects of the core polarization. In another approach [11, 18] large basis shell-model calculations were performed. However, in the last case there is a serious problem: the basis necessary to describe simultaneously the effects of both regular nuclear forces and

P-odd ones is in fact too large. Therefore, some additional approximations were made in [11, 18] in order to reduce the size of the basis space.

Fortunately, the Tl nucleus is a rather special case in the many-body approach as well. Not only is it close to the doubly-magic ^{208}Pb, but its unpaired proton is $3s_{1/2}$, but not $1h_{9/2}$ as in Bi. This makes the effects of the core polarization here relatively small. Thus the density of states in Tl is reduced, and an effective Hamiltonian suitable for shell-model calculations can be constructed [19]. This Hamiltonian was used in [16] to calculate the anapole moment of Tl nucleus. The result of [16] and the RPA result of [17] for the thallium coincide, in spite of completely different descriptions of nuclear forces used in these works to calculate the core polarization. These results of [16, 17] differ essentially from the value obtained in [18] under extra assumptions: the closure approximation and further reduction of a three-body matrix element to the two-body one. It is also worth mentioning perhaps that in [16, 17] and [18] different parameterizations of the parity violating nuclear forces have been used.

Thus we believe that the theoretical predictions for the AMs of nuclei of the present experimental interest, can be reasonably summarized now, at "best values" of P-odd constants, as follows:

$$\kappa(^{133}\mathrm{Cs}) = 0.15 - 0.21, \quad \kappa(^{203,205}\mathrm{Tl}) = 0.24, \quad \kappa(^{209}\mathrm{Bi}) = 0.15. \tag{4}$$

We believe also that there are good reasons to consider these predictions as sufficiently reliable, at the accepted values of the P-odd nuclear constants.

The comparison of the value (4) for the cesium AM with the experimental result (2) indicates that the "best values" of [8] somewhat underestimate the magnitude of P-odd nuclear forces. In no way is this conclusion trivial. The point is that the magnitude of parity-nonconserving effects found in some nuclear experiments is much smaller than that following from the "best values" (see review [20]). In all these experiments, however, either the experimental accuracy is not high enough, or the theoretical interpretation is not sufficiently convincing. The experiment [4] looks much more reliable in both respects.

Here it should be mentioned however that the experimental result for the thallium AM, $\kappa = -0.22 \pm 0.30$ [21], does not comply with the theoretical prediction for it presented in (4) (the disagreement will be even more serious if one assumes that the nuclear P-odd constants are larger than the "best values" of [8] as indicated by the measurement of the cesium AM). Obviously, it is highly desirable for this problem to be cleared up.

Clearly, in line with its general physics interest, the investigation of nuclear AMs in atomic experiments is first-rate, almost table-top nuclear physics.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Yu.P. Gangrsky and B.N. Markov for their interest to the problem and the suggestion to write this note. The work was supported in part by the Grant No. 00-15-96811 for Leading Scientific Schools, and by the Federal Program Integration-2001.

References

[1] Ya.B. Zel'dovich, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33** (1957) 1531 [Sov. Phys. JETP **6** (1957) 1184] (the paper contains also the mention of the analogous results obtained by V.G. Vaks.)

[2] V.V. Flambaum, I.B. Khriplovich, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79** (1980) 1656 [Sov. Phys. JETP **52** (1980) 835]

[3] V.V. Flambaum, I.B. Khriplovich, O.P. Sushkov, Phys. Lett. **B146** (1984) 367

[4] C.S. Woods et al., Science **275** (1997) 1759

[5] P.A. Frantsuzov, I.B. Khriplovich, Z. Phys. **D7** (1988) 297

[6] A.Ya. Kraftmakher, Phys. Lett. **A132** (1988) 167

[7] F. Curtis Michel, Phys. Rev. **B133** (1964) 329

[8] B. Desplanques, J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, Ann. Phys. **124** (1980) 449

[9] V.F. Dmitriev et al., Phys. Lett. **B125** (1983) 1

[10] V.V. Flambaum, V.B. Telitsin, O.P. Sushkov, Nucl. Phys. **A444** (1985) 611

[11] W.C. Haxton, E.M. Henley, M.J. Musolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 949

[12] C. Bouchiat, C.A. Piketty, Z. Phys. **C49** (1991) 91

[13] C. Bouchiat, C.A. Piketty, Phys. Lett. **B269** (1991) 195; erratum **B274** (1992) 526

[14] V.F. Dmitriev, I.B. Khriplovich, V.B. Telitsin, Nucl. Phys. **A577** (1994) 691

[15] V.F. Dmitriev, V.B. Telitsin, Nucl. Phys. **A613** (1997) 237

[16] N. Auerbach, B.A. Brown, Phys. Rev. **C60** (1999) 025501

[17] V.F. Dmitriev, V.B. Telitsin, Nucl. Phys. **A674** (2000) 168

[18] W.C. Haxton, C.-P. Liu, M.J. Ramsey-Musolf, nucl-th/0109014

[19] L. Rydstrom et al., Nucl. Phys. **A512** (1990) 217

[20] E.G. Adelberger, W.C. Haxton, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. **35** (1985) 501

[21] P.A. Vetter et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 2658